EXAMINING THE FLEXIBILITY OF TIM BARREL PROTEINS BASED ON THEIR STRUCTURAL TOPOLOGY



Sandhya Tiwari, Nathalie Reuter.

Computational Biology Unit and Department of Molecular Biology, University of Bergen, Norway,

The eight-fold beta/alpha barrel-like fold, first seen in triosephosphate isomerase (TIM), is a common and versatile fold for proteins. Proteins in this classification have diverse enzymatic functions spanning five of six Enzyme Commission classes¹.

Studies have characterized the sequence, structure, localized dynamics and electrostatics of TIM proteins, but the flexibility of the fold is understudied.



behave independently of the eight flanking alpha helices. The strands and helices repeat in tandem at the sequence level, yet the strands form a core that moves minimally while the helices display greater relative mobility in all of the structures.

Normal Mode Analysis

The normal modes are eigenvectors of the matrix of the second derivatives of the potential for each atom in a given structure. For the coarse grained analysis, we used a form of Elastic Network Model defined by the C-alpha forcefield³ in MMTK⁴ to simplify computation. The all-atom analysis was performed using MMTK using the Amber99 force field⁵. The structure was minimized using 10 000 steps with the steepest descent algorithm, and subsequently conjugate gradient algorithm until convergence was reached. Then the matrix was diagonalised to retrieve the normal modes allowing only rigid body movement of the residues⁶.

Atomic fluctuations

$$f(i) = \frac{1}{m_i} \sum_{s=0}^{sw-0} \frac{\mathbf{v}_{si} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{si}}{\lambda_s}$$

The fluctuations refer to the normalized squared fluctuations (or RMSF) given by the equation. Here, m refers to the mass of the atom, v_{vi} refers to the vector of the atom *i* in mode x and λ_{v} the eigenvalue of mode x. These values correspond to theoretical Bfactors for all modes excluding the first six rigid-body modes.

To do the comparative analysis between multiple TIM barrels. structural alignments done using Mustang⁷ were used.

We looked at the principle TIM beta/alpha barrel secondary structure elements of five structures from distinct families with low sequence similarity between 23 and 38.5 % and low structure similarity.



Despite the low sequence similarity, we found that the normal modes at the 1010 points of structural similarity shows 3CH0 that there is a conservation of 3CWN dynamics. This is seen in the score 1N55 given by the Bhattacharya coefficient8. 1660



We found that the atomic fluctuations of each of the beta-strands have a high correlation with its immediate beta-strand neighbour in the core. Compared to the beta strands, the alpha helices have less correlation with each other and almost none with the strands.



All-atom vs. coarse-grained correlation matrices. The matrix represents the correlation between the atomic fluctuations of pairs of atoms within a structure.





This core formed by the beta-strands is rigid in all the structures. This is despite the varying loop lengths between them and the presence of accessory secondary structures in some cases. This leads us to hypothesise that the movements of the TIM does not follow its toroidal structural description but rather as a **barrel within a barrel**.



3.Struct

We also defined rotation and translation vectors to decompose the type of movements to which the normal modes of these TIMs correspond, based on the barrel-in-barrel description.



We show an example of a result from the methods above in characterising the nature of TIM Barrel's flexibility at the fold level.

The cumulative overlap from Barrel rotation showing the motions of the helical bundle and the beta-barrel core. While the helical bundle seems to have a greater preference for rotational motion in comparison with the beta barrel core, it varies quite greatly from structure to structure.



In conclusion, the normal modes of TIM are able to characterise its flexibility at the fold level, which gives us insight into its versatility. Our methods can pick out the commonalities between these proteins, such as the rigidity of the beta-barrel core, despite the low sequence and structure conservation.

References

I. Nagano N., Orengo C. A., Thornton J. M., J. Mol. Bio., 2002, (321) 741–7652 Taylor, W. R. et al., Rep. Prog. Phys., 2001, (64)517–590
Hinsen K. et al., Chem. Phys. 2000, (261)25–37 Hinsen K., J. Comput. Chem. 2000, (21)79–85
Lee M and Duan Y., Proteins, 2004, (55)620–634
Hinsen, K. and Kneller, G., 2000, Mol. Simul., (23)275–292 7. Konagurthu, A., et al., 2006, Proteins, 64(3), 559-574 8.Fuglebakk, E., et al., 2012, Bioinformatics, 28(19)2431-40